DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 5[illegible] CS 504 705

AUTHOR	Stoner, Mark R.
TITLE	Free Speech at Berkeley: "University as Factory," An Argument from Analogy.
PUB DATE	Nov 84
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism; Civil Rights; *Discourse Analysis; Ethics; Evaluation Criteria; *Freedom of Speech; Higher Education; *Metaphors; *Persuasive Discourse; Speech Communication; *Student College Relationship; Student Rights
IDENTIFIERS	*Free Speech Movement; University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

Although many metaphors were developed throughout the Free Speech Movement at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, the central metaphor of the movement was the university as a factory. The analogy was used to argue that trends in higher education were moving toward the dehumanization of students and was related to the national concern over lack of freedom by many to exercise their constitutionally mandated civil rights. Students argued that university involvement with industry was mercenary and that students were used, like raw materials, to be molded into prefabricated cogs to fit easily into the machinery of government and industry. The movement, by its use of the structural analogy--university as factory--chose an extremely powerful argumentative tool and a useful image that lent itself to quick and wide dissemination among members of the movement. The continued development of metaphors allowed the leadership to control the analogy to a fairly high degree. However, when compared to the standards of ethics proposed by Richard Weaver, the Free Speech Movement--because of certain unwarranted uses of words as "free speech", its desire to eradicate hierarchical distinctions at the university, and its failure to recognize the constraints placed upon the university--must be judged as ethically suspect with regard to rhetoric. (HOD)

Free Speech at Berkeley: 'University as Factory,' An Argument from Analogy

Mark R. Stoner
Mount Vernon Nazarene College
Mount Vernon, OH 43050

Presented at the 70th Annual Meeting
of the
Speech Communication Association
Chicago, Illinois
November 1-4, 1984

Twenty years ago, America was beginning a process of change so wide-ranging as to be unimaginable by most citizens. The civil rights movement was developing quickly; the Viet Nam War was beginning to take a central place on our national agenda. At the Berkeley campus of the University of California, student unrest (to become known as the Free Speech Movement) was underway that, with the civil rights and anti-war movements, would effect great changes in American values. The intent of this paper is to analyze the rhetoric of the Free Speech Movement from its beginning in September, 1964, to its disappearance by 1966. Three concerns will be addressed in the course of the analysis: The use of the central metaphor of university as factory; an analysis of the ethics of that argument[1]; and an evaluation of rhetorical theory used in the above analysis.[2] The data to be examined in this paper are diverse in kind: samples of FSM literature such as fliers and transcripted speeches; published essays by FSM leaders; interviews and newspaper accounts; and audio taped speeches by Jack Weinberg and other student leaders. From this information, the study shows the analogy[3] of the university as factory was a central and essentially unchanging argument employed by the FSM against University of California policies regarding freedom of speech on campus.

The University as Factory

Although a number of metaphors were developed throughout the Free Speech Movement, the central metaphor of the movement was the university as a factory. This developed, I think, in response to two

currents of ideas. Clark Kerr had, in 1963, published his analysis of American higher education and had cited a growing identity between American industry and her larger institutions of higher learning.[4] The increasing size of the University of California and the increasing alienation felt by the students were, by Autumn of 1964, converging and raising tensions on campus. The second current was the civil-rights movement as it developed across the nation. Berkeley students had been highly involved in local, Bay-area advocacy for the poor and minorities; many who became leaders in the FSM had spent the summer of 1964 in the deep South organizing the people and participating in marches and demonstrations. Mario Savio, the leader of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley wrote in 1965:

> The university set about denying students access to those facilities and rights on campus which had made possible student involvement in the civil-rights movement in the previous years. Yet very rapidly the concern of the movement shifted from Mississippi to much closer to home; we soon began doing an awful lot of talking and thinking about the limitations of the university, the "Multiversity," the "knowledge industry"-- these metaphors became ever more a part of the rhetoric of the movement.[5]

The factory metaphors gained increasing usage, eventually subsuming both the civil rights and free speech themes.

As early as the summer of 1964, the university as factory metaphor was salient among campus activists. At the beginning of each quarter, a "supplement" to the University catalogue was published by SLATE, (a left wing student political party) which evaluated performances of individual teachers.[6] In the SLATE publication, a summer supplement was included entitled, "A Letter to the Undergraduates." The article centered on the machine-like nature of the university and developed a number of related subthemes throughout: "...the university stamps out consciousness

like a super-Madison-Avenue-machine," it stated.[7] Brad Cleaveland, the author, went on:

> THE MULTIVERSITY IS NOT AN EDUCATIONAL CENTER, BUT A HIGHLY EFFICIENT INDUSTRY. IT PRODUCES BOMBS, OTHER WAR MACHINES, A FEW TOKEN "PEACEFUL" MACHINES, AND ENORMOUS NUMBERS OF SAFE HIGHLY SKILLED, AND RESPECTABLE AUTOMATONS TO MEET THE IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT.[8]

After a lengthy discussion of who comprised the board of regents and of what their investment portfolios consisted, Cleaveland concluded:

> In these men, you find substantial ownership and control of the vital raw materials and service industries of the West...As corporate men of power, the Regents are getting precisely what they most desire--enormous numbers of highly skilled graduates to fill the corporate structure and keep it running smoothly.[9]

The writer concluded with a suggestion that undergraduates support any and all work stoppages student employees on campus may attempt in fighting the "machine":

> If such a walkout occurs again (student editors had walked out at Daily Cal) as it did a couple of years ago, it might be wise to consider an effective picket to try to keep out the same type of fraternity scabs who took over last time in an action which was traitorous to the undergraduates.[10]

As early as September 10, 1964, prior to the administrations' order to abandon the Bancroft-Telegraph strip, a highly developed analogy of factory, bureaucracy, labor, and strike was widely published on campus.

This analogy was further developed at the beginning of the uprising. On October 1, 1964, numerous campus organizations chose to defy university regulations by manning recruitment tables outside Sproul Hall (the administration building). Campus police and administrators focused on the SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) table and arrested Jack Weinberg, a former Cal student. Weinberg delivered a speech upon his arrest. In a very calm, almost professorial tone, Weinberg outlined the resemblance of the

university to the factory, concluding with a statement linking the dehumanization of the Factory with civil-rights concerns:

> I want to tell you about this knowledge factory. It seems that certain products are not coming out to standard specifications...and I feel the university is trying to purge these products so they can once again produce for the industry exactly what they specify. This is a Knowledge factory, if you read Clark Kerr's book, these are his precise words...
> We want to see social change in the world in which we live. We are human beings who have ideas...We feel that we as human beings first and students, we must take our stand on every vital issue which faces this nation and, in particular, the vital issue of discrimination, of segregation, of poverty, of unemployment.[11]

Even at that early date, the analogy of factory was a primary focus of the rhetoric and the civil-rights of students was an issue logically derived from the nature of the university.

After Weinberg's arrest, he was placed in a campus police car which was "captured" by the students sitting down on all sides. The incident significantly heightened tensions. The car with Weinberg inside was held by the students for a total of thirty-two hours, during which time the roof was used as a platform for a variety of speakers. Attacks on the administration and university became increasingly vociferous. An unidentified student shouted to an agitated crowd:

> We will organize this campus if those charges [against Weinberg and seven others] are not dropped because this is the limit! We'll organize this campus like the C.I.O. organized the factories! (Crowd cheers wildly in agreement).[12]

From the police car, many of the students, under the leadership of Mario Savio moved to Sproul Hall to sit-in "to cause the wheels to grind to a halt."[13] During the Sproul Hall sit-in Savio delivered a speech, which was later transcribed and published as an essay. Again, the dual ideas of civil rights and the "knowledge factory" were raised; the knowledge factory metaphor was developed and became central. Savio stated, in part:

> The most crucial problems facing the United States today are the problem of automation and the problem of racial injustice...students and faculty are respectively raw material and employees...
> ...The conception of Clark Kerr...is that the university is part and parcel of this particular stage in the history of American society; it is a factory that turns out a certain product needed by industry or government.[14]

The metaphor of university as factory clearly is the central theme of the address. The relationship between the university and industry continued to be emphasized and developed.

Throughout the fall and early winter, the same refrain continued to be sung by the FSM. In December, Savio continued to have access to media channels:

> 'This factory does unjust things and we'll have to cause the wheels to grind to a halt,' Savio said in a rally on the steps of Sproul Hall.
> 'If we don't get our constitutional rights, we won't let the machine operate.'[15]

The next day he was quoted as saying,

> The administration is a factory. The faculty is the workforce and we students are the raw material. But we will not be made into a product...We are human beings.[16]

The development of the analogy, especially in the relational metaphors, at times was haphazard. In an anonymous FSM newsletter, the relationship of students to or as raw material is somewhat clouded:

> ...we are human beings and so cannot forever be treated as raw materials to be processed. Clark Kerr has declared... that a university must be like any other factory--a place where workers who handle raw materials are themselves handled like raw materials by the administrators above them.[17]

Through December[18], January[19], February[20], and on into the spring[21] the factory analogy continued to be used and supporting metaphors developed. Even into the fall of 1966, Savio and other hangers-on were yet repeating the same message that they had been repeating for over two years. Savio's last statement of his last article published on the uprising was:

> And we will secure the right to a decent education only when we have organized ourselves independently of both faculty and administration, in much the same way that workers have organized themselves into the trade unions.[22]

This sampling of FSM rhetoric indicates a clear use of and development of the university as factory analogy over at least a two year period. The analogy was used as a logic to argue that trends in higher education were toward the dehumanization of students and was related to the national concern over lack of freedom by many to exercise their constitutionally mandated civil rights. Students argued that the university involvement with industry was mercenary, that the students were used, like raw materials, to be molded into prefabricated cogs to fit easily into the machinery of government and industry. The argument was widely used by rhetors within, sympathetic to, and outside of the movement over a relatively long period of time. The theoretical question that must be answered is: was this choice of argument the best choice that could be made?

I.A. Richards wrote, "Thought is metaphoric, and proceeds by comparison, and the metaphors of language derive therefrom."[23] Richard Weaver stated, "What we more than suspect is that all language is metaphorical in origin, and the use of metaphor is distinctly intellectual and non-naturalistic."[24] Metaphor seems to be basic to our language use and thought. Secksteder concluded from his study of analogy and logic that "inferences of logic are instances of a rule derivative from our analogies..."[25] Given the centrality of analogy to thought and inference, one might judge the use of a central analogy by the Free Speech Movement as wise and necessary. Further analysis will support the claim that the use of analogy was the best rhetorical choice.

If the strength of any reasoning by analogy rests on important comparisons, then some categories or guides to such comparisions are

necessary. The choice of comparison must rest on essential points of comparison to enhance any analogy's proof and persuasive value.[26] Within the structural analogue model developed by Sacksteder, the essential comparisons are comparisons of qualities and relations leading to the structural analogy. The analogy of university as factory was a structural analogy requiring for its strength such quality and relational metaphors in the development of the argument. Within the samples cited above, clearly the rhetors compared the quality of education and the quality of life they were experiencing to the quality of life experienced by the factory laborer. Also, in the development of the analogy, relational metaphors were made regarding the relation of students to administration, students to faculty, faculty to students, and faculty to university; also metaphors relating students and student work to laborers and labor were made. From this vast development of essential quality and relational metaphors was constructed a powerful structural analogy. The logic in its own right was compelling, but one final factor must be considered. Sacksteder stated, "Once granted, a structural analogy justifies numerous arguments of various kinds."[27] So, such an analogy, in essence, becomes a rule of logic for the development of further arguments, based on the primary structural analogy. In this case, the FSM chose not only a strong argument, but wisely chose to use an analogy originally conceived by its opponent. The genius of the use of the factory analogy was that the administration had granted the analogy; in fact, nowhere have I read any disclaimer made by Kerr to the analogy or its interpretation. The movement, by its use of the structural analogy, university as factory, chose an extremely powerful argumentative tool and a useful image that lent itself to quick and wide dissemination among members of the movement. The continued development of quality and relational metaphors

allowed the leadership to control the analogy to a fairly high degree.[28] The conclusion is that, given the circumstances of initiating a movement quickly and the desire to make a strong argument, no better choice could have been made.

The Ethics of the Factory Metaphor

When choices are possible, the question of ethics is immediately important. Since the argument analyzed herein is an analogy, it would seem most appropriate to evaluate the argument according to ethical criteria that grow out of an understanding of the philosophical underpinnings placing analogy at the heart of our ability to interact symbolically.

Charles Follette has argued that metaphor, to be meaningful, must appeal to some absolute criteria--the basic values we hold. Thus, to say "a" is better than "b", it must be in respect to a "c".[29] Any judgment made by analogy, then, "presupposes the existence of a real criterial absolute which is beyond direct perception or comprehensive expression and which is unconditional and ultimate."[30] Since analogy requires values to be meaningful, evaluation of analogical arguments would best be made by a compatible scheme. Richard Weaver has suggested five criteria by which to make evaluation of analogies. The criteria are:

> 1) Arguments from genus and from similitude are ethically preferrable to arguments from consequences or from circumstances.
> 2) Pseudo-neutrality in language usage is ethically suspect.
> 3) Unwarranted shifts in meaning of words are ethically suspect.
> 4) Communication which blurs necessary distinctions is ethically suspect.
> 5) Public discourse which focuses solely on the realm of the ideal or hypothetical avoiding attempts to link the ideal with the actual, is ethically suspect.[31]

According to Weaver, the argument from similitude is a preferrable argument. He wrote,

> "...the cosmos is one vast system of analogy, so that our profoundest intuitions of it are made in the form of comparisons."[32]

According to Weaver, the analogy is basic, a given fact of nature. Also analogy is reasoning from something we know to something we do not know in one step...the user of analogy is hinting at an essence which cannot at the moment be produced.[33] The FSM made an ethical choice on two counts: one, they chose to employ the argument from analogy, basing their argument on widely held values as the criterial absolute; such values were claimed to be the basic values of freedom of speech, and the right to pursue life, liberty and happiness. The argument became, essentially, "the university as it was intended to preserve free speech and free choice is preferrable to the factory that does not allow real exercise of basic values." Second, the argument was also attempting to construct what was at that time an unknown vision of the ideal university. Jack Weinberg described the uncertainty of the issues and concerns:

> The same kind of force which creates a wildcat strike has created the FSM. Alienation and hostility exist, but neither are focused at specific grievances nor well articulated... Suddenly there is an issue, everyone recognizes it, everyone grabs at it.[34]

The argument from the known to the unknown, from know constraints within the university to the unknown-as-yet ideal university, was the only appropriate choice given Weaver's first criterion.

The second standard for judging rhetoric as ethical is that pseudo-neutral language not be used. Weaver argued that some language considered to be neutral is, infact, not. For example, he cited the use of such terms as "underpriviliged" and "undesirable" in social science as terms thought to be neutral, but are not.[35] Certainly, the FSM could not be accused of pseudo-objectivity in its rhetoric. It was blatantly polemic and made no attempt or pretense to objectivity. Each camp knew exactly where the other stood. Johannesen made clear that Weaver feels that "concealed rhetoric"

results in 'deception rather than in open and legitimate argument.'"[36] Certainly the FSM made no effort to conceal its concerns, beliefs or motives. According to the second criterion, FSM rhetoric must be judged as ethical since it in no way attempted to avoid scrutiny or mask its controversial ideas.

Weaver suggested, as a third standard of ethics that "unwarranted shifts in meanings of words are ethically suspect." Words are a covenant and improper or unwarranted shifts in the agreed upon usage of a word breaks the covenant. Weaver is quoted as describing a particular kind of shift, what he called "rhetorical prevarication" as taking "the word out of one context and put it in another in order to advance an ideology."[37] Within the strict confines of actual use of the factory metaphor and the related quality and relational metaphors, unexpected or unwarranted shifts of word usage are not noted. However, as the analytical apparatus moves back for a more sweeping look at the movement, the FSM is open to criticism in its use of such terms as "free speech" and "civil rights". "Free speech" became for the FSM, not a term denoting a societal norm of freedom of expression of important ideas in debates regarding social policy, which is a relatively strict constructionist view, but a term allowing <u>any</u> kind of verbal or nonverbal expression without bounds. "Free speech" became a term for expressive license unconcerned with standards of propriety from any part of society. In the same way "civil-rights" became a term for unbounded personal action rather than the exercise of all behaviors granted citizens within the parameters of the Consitution. Thus, within the Free Speech Movement, central terms such as "free speech" and "civil rights" shifted meanings from those understood by society at large to those meanings used by the FSM in its dealings with those outside the movement <u>as if</u> the meanings were unchanged. Thus, the FSM must be judged as unethical in its use of key terms such as "free speech" and "civil rights."

The fourth criterion suggested by Weaver was communication which blurs necessary distinctions is ethically suspect. Two concerns are central to this standard. First, Weaver questioned the ethics of radicals who would argue for the removal of all distinctions or hierarchies in society.[38] Second, a blurring can occur through those who cannot recognize a polar situation and argue in the "excluded middle."[39] The first concern, that of removing distinctions is most important in this analysis. The FSM argued for increasing power for students to the point of taking over the role of the Regents in controlling the university. They argued for equal power and status with the faculty and administration. Weaver worried that such a lack of acceptance of legitimate authority flies in the face of a democratic society.[40] Certainly the result of such talk, as the FSM acted upon it and closed down the university, did not resemble democratic action, but resembled more closely the tactics and results of totalitarian revolutions. The claim, the university should not be like the factory had an inherent rejection of levels of management and power. According to this fourth standard, FSM rhetoric must be judged ethically suspect.

Finally, Weaver asserts that ethical rhetoric links the ideal with the real. "Responsible rhetoric must take cognizance of all facts and realities and must interpret those facts in light of controlling principles and ideals."[41] "Ideas must have historicity as well as logicality," wrote Weaver.[42] Thus, ideas suggested or advocated must be tempered by placing them in a clear historical context; to do otherwise would be irresponsible rhetoric. The FSM rejected vehemently Clark Kerr's historical analysis of the American university. Their ideal of the student-led, egalitarian, leisurely, open, and politically independent university had no precedent in history, nor any relationship to the then present political, economic, and social parameters faced by all large American universities. In light of Weaver's final

criterion, FSM rhetoric appears to be less rather than more ethical when judged against the proposed standards of ethics suggested by Weaver. This must be a tentative conclusion, however, until further testing of the standards is done and a deeper, more detailed analysis of FSM ethics can be accomplished.

In conclusion, I have argued that analogies as those used by the Free Speech Movement are arguments that are logical and preferrable to other kinds of arguments. I further argued that the Free Speech Movement employed the analogy, the university as factory through the life of the movement, and that given the rhetorical constraints described, made a wise decision in employing it as an argument. Third, I argued that, when compared to the standards of ethics proposed by Richard Weaver, the Free Speech Movement, because of certain unwarranted uses of words as "free speech"; their desire to eradicate hierarchical distinctions at the university; and their failure to recognize the constraints placed upon the university, must be judged as ethically suspect with regard to rhetoric.

An Evaluation of Theory

Finally, the tools of evaluation must themselves be judged. The explanation of the logical basis and power of the analogy given by Wilcox and Ewbank, and Sacksteder were most helpful in accounting for the use of analogy as argument and explaining the proof and persuasion power of analogy. Also, the model of the structural analogy accounted for the control needed by the rhetor to be effective. It did this much more satisfactorily than the stimulus-response model.

The ethical standards proposed by Weaver produced mixed observations regarding the ethics of the Free Speech Movement. The "fit" of this scheme, however, was much more satisfactory than an Aristotelian analysis.[43]

The weakness of the analysis does not so much lie with Weaver as the focus and scope of this essay. More certain conclusions about the ethics of the FSM may be reached, if the topic is treated by itself rather than as a part of a broader study. Weaver's standards were "proposed" and require further refinement. Until the two shortcomings mentioned are ameliorated, or until a more appropriate and refined method of analysis is uncovered, the claims of this essay regarding the ethics of the FSM must be tentative.

Endnotes

[1]Andrews, James R., The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1983), pp. 60-61; Cathcart, Robert, Post Communication: Rhetorical Analysis and Evaluation, 2nd ed., (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1981), pp. 109-123.

[2]Andrews, The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism, p. 12; Cathcart, Post Communication, pp. 8-15.

[3]The use of metaphor and analogy as different facets of the same mode of argument is common in the literature examined and thus, in this analysis, the terms will be used interchangeably. See Wilcox, James R. and Ewbank, H.L., "Analogy for Rhetors," Philosophy and Rhetoric 12 (Winter 1979): 2-3; Weaver, Richard M., The Ethics of Rhetoric, (Chicago: Henry Regency Company, 1953), p. 203; Richards, I.A., The Philosophy of Rhetoric, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 9.

[4]Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 88, 94.

[5]Savio, Mario, "Introduction," in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Hal Draper, ed., pp. 5-6.

[6]Heirich, Max, The Spiral of Conflict: Berkeley, 1964, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), p. 99.

[7]Cleaveland, Bradford, "A Letter to Undergraduates," in The Berkeley Student Revolt, eds., Seymour Lipset and Sheldon Wolin, p. 67.

[8]Ibid., p. 75.

[9]Ibid., p. 77-78.

[10]Ibid., p. 81.

[11]Audio tape "The Free Speech Movement at Berkeley," G. Robert Vincent Voice Library, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1048.

[12]Ibid.

[13]San Francisco Chronicle, December 3, 1964, p. 1.

[14]Savio, Mario, "An End to History," in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Hal Draper, ed.

[15]San Francisco Chronicle, December 2, 1964, p. 1; Time, December 11, 1964, p. 60.

[16]San Francisco Chronicle, December 3, 1964, p. 1.

[17]"FSM Newsletter" in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Hal Draper, ed., p. 225.

[18]Ibid., "We Want a University" by the FSM Steering Committee, pp. 191-198; Taylor, Harold, "The Academic Industry: A Discussion of Clark Kerr's The Uses of the University," Commentary, December, 1964.

[19]Garson, Marvin, "The Regents" in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Hal Draper, ed., p. 220. Originally published by the FSM; James Petras, "On Mounting Political Action," a transcript from radio station KPFA recording, published in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, p. 222; Weinberg, Jack, "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights" in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, p. 183-188.

[20]Boler, John F. "Behind the Protests at Berkeley", Commonweal 81 (February 5, 1965). In this article Boler suggests a concern for relational and structural problems that need addressed by the parties in conflict. "The issues now facing the Berkeley campus and other American universities concern the internal structure of the university community and the relevance of politics to the community," p. 604. These themes of the central analogy are important because of the logical power they have within the fully developed university as factory structural analogy; Fincher, J. "The Universit Has Become a Factory", Life 58 February 26, 1965, pp. 100-101. This interview with Savio continues to extend the metaphor: "The university is a vast public utility," Savio stated, "which turns out future workers in today's vineyard, the military-industrial complex", p. 100.

[21]Abrams, Richard, "The Student Rebellion at Berkeley--An Interpretation," Massachusetts Review, 6 (Winter-Spring, 1965).

[22]Savio, Mario, "The Uncertain Future of the Multiversity", Harper's Magazine, (October, 1966), p. 94. I have been unable to uncover any more recent articles by Savio and conclude this is his last.

[23]Richards, I.A., The Philosophy of Rhetoric, P. 94.

[24]Weaver, Richard M., Visions of Order: The Cultural Crisis of Our Time (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), p. 142.

[25]Sacksteder, Wm. "The Logic of Analogy", Philosophy and Rhetoric 7 (Fall, 1974): 252.

[26]Graham, Gladys Murphy, "Analogy--A STudy in Proof and Persuasion Values," Quarterly Journal of Speech 14 (November, 1928), pp. 534-542.

[27]Sacksteder, Wm. "The Logic of Analogy", p. 245.

[28]When using the analogy heuristically, that is, when one element is not known, it is essential that a context be developed that allows only one or a limited number of vehicles to complete the statement: a:b::b:X. The argument cannot be made if an infinite number of possibilities exist that could replace X. Absolute control is probably not possible; otherwise, there would be no surprise, an important factor in the use of metaphor in the first place.

[29]Follette, Charles, "Deep Rhetoric: A Substantive Alternative to Consequentialism in Exploring the Ethics of Rhetoric", in Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation, George Zeigelmueller and Jack Rhodes, eds., (Speech Communication Association,

[30]Ibid., p. 997.

[31]Johanessen, Richard L., "Richard M. Weaver on Standards for Ethical Rhetoric", Central States Speech Journal 29 (Summer, 1978), pp. 129-134.

[32]Johanessen, Richard L., Strickland, Rennard, and Ewbanks, Ralph T., eds., Language is Sermonic: Richard Weaver on the Nature of Rhetoric, p. 214.

[33]Ibid., p. 213.

[34]Weinberg, Jack, "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights", in Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Hal Draper, ed., p. 185.

[35]Johanessen, Richard L., "Richard M. Weaver on Standards for Ethical Rhetoric", P. 131.

[36]Ibid., p. 131.

[37]Ibid., p. 132.

[38]Ibid., P. 133.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Ibid., p. 134.

[42]Weaver, Richard, Visions of Order, p. 63.

[43]Follette, Charles, "Deep Rhetoric", in Dimensions of Argument, George Zeigelmueller and Jack Rhodes, eds., p. 998. Here Follette quoted Maurice Natanson who complained that we have drawn more of a manual of oratorical technique from Aristotle than a philosophy of rhetoric. I agree in that Aristotelian standards as presented in Flynn, Lawrence L., "The Aristotelian Basis for the Ethics of Speaking", The Speech Teacher 6 (September 1957): 179-187, allowed only a superficial cataloging of behavior rather than judgment of a speaker by a critic.